



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Council is not reckoned as one? Laurentius Sarius, a very learned man in Roman councils, says—"No one of sound mind can doubt that this Lateran Synod which follows was distinguished among the chief, and truly oecumenical. As being one in which the affairs of religion were treated with the greatest concord of the Greek and Latin Church, at which were present the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and SEVENTY archbishops, as well Latin as Greek, four hundred and twelve bishops, more than eight hundred abbots and priors—all the prelates, together, TWELVE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN, or more."* And the canon law itself pronounces this a general council, as we shall see presently.

If this were not a general Roman council, what was?

Now let us see what this council did. They passed 70 canons. The first is—"de fide Catholica"—a confession of faith. The second is the condemnation of the doctrine of the Abbot Joachim. The third, about heretics, &c., &c. All passed by the same authority.

Now, let any Protestant only say, in our pages, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was never decreed by any general council of the Roman Church before the Council of Trent, and then we should have a host of correspondents exclaiming against such ignorance, and pointing to the first canon of this very Council of Lateran, as the solemn decision of a general council in favour of Transubstantiation. We should admit that Roman Catholics are correct in giving such an answer. But when we then quote the 3rd canon of this very same council, as containing the decision of a Roman general council about heretics, what right have Roman Catholics, then, to turn round on us and say, that it is not a decree of a general council?

We can, however, prove, against them, that it is. We prove it from their own canon law. The Roman canonists of the present century lay it down that, whatever is in the decretals of Pope Gregory IX., is the law of the Church of Rome.†

Now, we turn to those decretals—Lib. v., Tit. vii., c. 13—and there we find this 3rd canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, and we find this heading to it—

"IDEM—viz., INNOCENT III.—IN CONCILIO GENERALI."

Thus the canon law itself declares this very canon to have been passed by a Pope in a general council.

Our readers will now like to see some extracts from this canon—"We excommunicate and anathematize EVERY HERESY which exalts itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith which we have expounded above; condemning all heretics, by whatever names they may be censured.

Let the secular powers be admonished, and induced, and, if necessary, let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, whatever offices they fill, that as they desire to be reputed and counted faithful, they publicly take an oath for the defence of the faith; that in sincerity, to the utmost of their strength, they will apply themselves to exterminate all heretics denounced by the Church.

But if the temporal lord, having been required and warned by the Church, shall have neglected to purge his land from this heretical foulness, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication, by the metropolitan and the other provincial bishops; and if he shall have despised to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the supreme Pontiff, that he (the Pope) may pronounce the vassals (or subjects) thenceforward absolved from their allegiance, and may expose his land to be seized by the Catholics, who shall possess it without any contradiction, the heretics being exterminated, and shall preserve it in purity of faith.‡

There is not one word in the whole canon about civil crimes. It is directed against "every heresy," and "all heretics." It is for "purity of faith," not for civil welfare. It is the Church compelling the civil power, by ecclesiastical censures, to persecute heretics.

Now let us see what Bishop Milner has to say in answer to this.

First, he speaks of the authority by which this decree was passed. "It must first be observed," he says, "who, were present at this council, and by whose authority these decrees of a temporal nature were passed. There were then present, besides the Pope and the bishops, either in person or by their ambassadors, the Greek and the Latin Emperors, the Kings of England, France, Hungary, the Sicilies, Arragon, Cyprus, and Jerusalem; and the representatives of a vast many other principalities and states; so that, in fact, this council was a congress of Christendom,

temporal as well as spiritual."—End of Controversy, letter 49.

Who, on reading this, does not think that this Council of Lateran was quite different in its constitution from the general councils of the Church of Rome—that it was, in fact, more of the nature of a Congress of the princes of Europe to settle the temporal affairs of Europe; and that for infallible decrees of the Church we must rather look to the purely spiritual councils of the Church?

Bishop Milner, it is true, does not say all this; but it was obviously what people would think on reading what he said, and that was just what the crafty bishop wished. The bishop knew as well as we do, that there never was a general council of the Church of Rome to which the princes of Europe were not summoned precisely as they were to this Council of Lateran. He knew that all the princes of Europe (Roman Catholic) were represented in the Council of Trent itself, precisely as they were in this Council of Lateran. But then he hoped that his readers would not know all this, and so wrote in a way that would lead them to think that this Lateran Council was an assembly of a quite different nature from the general councils, which are supposed to speak the sense of the Church. It is an instance of the disingenuous artifice by which this writer is always ready to take advantage of the ignorance of his readers. But such artifices are never used by clever men, except when they are conscious that their cause is bad, and that truth is against them.

And did Bishop Milner really suppose that in the Church of Rome ecclesiastical censures emanate from the princes and not from the bishops?

Second, Bishop Milner says—"The decree of the council regarded only the prevailing heretics of that time." But we have given the very words of the decree above—"Every heresy," "all heretics, by whatever names they may be censured," "all heretics denounced by the Church."

Is there one word here to confine the canon to heretics guilty of crimes? Does it not expressly speak of "ALL heretics?" Is there one word to confine it to the heretics of that time? If that were its meaning, why did Pope Gregory IX., twenty years after, embody it into a code of laws intended for all future ages—a code still held at Rome as being the law of the Church?

The fact is clear. A general council of the Church of Rome, with a Pope at its head, has made a decree in a point of morals, which all Roman Catholics now see was wrong; but they think it still necessary to maintain that a general council, with a Pope at its head, cannot go wrong, either in faith or morals. And so they are driven to every shift and evasion to try and get rid of this decree, against the plainest evidence of its authority and meaning. Let them not be content with such wretched shifts where God's truth and the salvation of their own souls are the things to be sought for. Let them confess that a Pope and a general council have erred against morals in this decree, and then they will be in a position to inquire, like honest men, whether a Pope and a general council have ever erred in a question of faith.

If our correspondent will tell us what work of Dr. Dixon's he refers to, we will attend to it.

ON BRUCIOLI'S BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to notice, for the benefit of your inquiring Roman Catholic readers, a letter, signed William Murphy, in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, of Jan., 1854, p. 11, wherein the Bible translated by A. Brucioli is offered as evidence that "in every Catholic (Roman) country the circulation of the Scriptures is encouraged." You, sir, have had frequent occasion to complain that Roman Catholics too much rely on second-hand evidence, and on arguments long since refuted; but, perhaps, the enlistment of A. Brucioli's Bible as creditable to the Church of Rome, affords the most notable example. Cardinal Wiseman, twenty years ago, referred to the same Bible, with similar purpose, in his Moorfield lectures, which called forth the admirable "letters" to Dr. Wiseman, by the late Vicar of Blackburn, Dr. Whittaker, wherein he says—"In the account you give of Brucioli's Bible there is not one particle of truth, with the exception of the date of the editio princeps. I am convinced that you never saw the book, and must have taken your account of this distinguished individual on very bad second-hand authority."—p. 175. Dr. Whittaker in proof states that Antonio Brucioli was compelled to fly from Florence, and, with some risk, saved his life, having fallen under the suspicion of heresy. That (according to Dr. McCre, in his "History of the Suppression of the Reformation in Italy," pp. 55, 56) Brucioli's Bible was ranked among prohibited books of the first class in the index of the Council of Trent. The Spanish index, then, before Dr. Whittaker, also holds it in the same class. That Brucioli's Bible was published "con privilegio de lo inclito Senata Veneto," and without any Roman authority whatever. Lastly, that the pictorial illustrations heading the 13th and 17th chapters of the Apocalypse, exhibit respectively a ferocious "beast" and the well-known impure female, described in the text as "madre de la fornicatione," each wearing the triple crown! the papal tiara!

I have myself seen Antonio Brucioli's Bible in Dr. Whittaker's library, and specially examined those boldly executed and instructive wood-cuts. Should Mr. William Murphy and his informant, the Editor of the Weekly Telegraph, only view the same, an indulgence which the Dublin libraries could no doubt afford, they will gladly withdraw their statement that "there was another (Italian version) by A. Brucioli (sic) in 1523 (1532), and that is promoted by all means within the command of the Church, of Popes, of cardinals, &c., &c."

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
EDWARD M. HEARN.

Hurst-green Parsonage,
January 27, 1855.

WHAT DOES ST. PETER SAY ABOUT THE POPES?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read with great interest the correspondence of Mr. Rourke in the columns of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and am happy to congratulate the members of the Roman and Protestant Churches on the auspicious circumstance of the truth being argumentatively contended for by the laity of both communities.

Priestcraft is but the working of ambition in the breasts and minds of unregenerate clergymen, who, excluded from its pursuits in the secular affairs of life, aim at the most fearful despotism that can be exercised over their fellow men, by means of that dark influence which is brought to bear upon spiritual hopes and fears in time and for eternity, and this craft succeeds only in proportion to the people's ignorance of the word of God, and their acceptance of other standards for their faith and practice; the true minister of the Gospel (Mark ix. 33 to 40. Hebrews viii. 1 to 6) does not seek to be a lord over God's heritage; he knows that he has authority in the Church only as it is committed to him, according to the revelations contained in Holy Scripture, and he makes no claim upon belief or submission of the judgment, for which he cannot appeal to the law and to the testimony of his God.

This world is the field in which wheat and tares are growing together till the harvest shall come, and wherever there is a priesthood or a ministry, there lurks in the hearts of the unconverted members of either body that proud spirit that would reign over men upon the earth and attain the glory of its kingdoms. The common safeguard against the most cruel of all tyrannies, lies in our capability of judging the pretensions that are put forth, and examining every ground of authority upon which they are asserted; looking no further than to secondary causes, we can see that it was the exercise of this right of judgment in a limited degree, that led to the comparative independence of the Gallican portion of the Church of Rome, and to the differences that have existed, not only between Jansenists and Jesuits, but between other more nearly accordant brotherhoods in the Papal system; it is the exercise of this right, ever under strictly-imposed limitations, that marks the distinction between the ultramontane and the more reasonable part of the subjects of the Roman see, and keeps alive whatever semblance of spiritual liberty they are either of them permitted to enjoy; it is the exercise of this right which, so far as it is properly carried out in every Church, operates as a check upon the ambition which is in man's fallen nature, whether that nature be clothed in priestly vestments or a layman's garb.

Now, sir, the Church of Rome makes high claims for its priesthood, and asserts that from them, and them only, the laity are to receive the dogmatic teaching of religion. Will Mr. Rourke kindly undertake to prove, for the benefit of every inquiring mind, from the inspired Epistles of St. Peter as his text, and the rest of Scripture for his corroborations—first, that the claims of the Pope and priesthood are right and true; and, secondly, that the dogmas which are exclusively Papal or Roman are in accordance with the sacred writings of the Apostle from whom the hierarchy of his Church claims descent? I ask this favour in all courtesy, and think that if he will accede to my request, he may, under God's blessing, either convince others of what is the truth, or elicit such arguments from you as may lead many to the knowledge of it as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord. A.

THE ADVANTAGE OF HAVING AN INFALLIBLE GUIDE: IN WHAT DOES IT CONSIST?

SIR—There is nothing the importance of which the Church of Rome dwells more upon than divine faith—by divine faith she means, not what we call a practical living, or sanctifying faith, but a faith which is unwavering, because built upon the testimony of a witness known to be infallible; all else she calls human faith, reasonings, and guesses, and she utterly despises it. Now, there are two questions, to decide which, she maintains the necessity of such an infallible authority. First, is the Bible the Word of God? And, secondly, what is the meaning of its written message? She would enforce upon men this dogma, that their faith, as to these two points, must be built on infallible authority; or else, it is no true faith, nor of any value at all. I will take these two questions separately.

* Labbe & Cossart, vol. xi., p. 238.
† Quidquid lectur in iis comprehenditur, legem facit. Devoti, Jus Canonium. Vol. i., 379. Romæ, 1837.

‡ Excommunicamus et anathematizamus, omnem heresim extolentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam Catholicam fidem, quam superius exposuimus, condemnantes universos hereticos, quibuscumque nominibus censeantur. . . . Moneantur autem, et inducantur, et, si necesse fuerit, pro censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur secularibus potestates, quibuscumque fungantur officis, ut sicut reputari cupiant et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præsentem publicum juramentum, quod de terris sue jurisdictionis subjectis universos hereticos ab ecclesia denotatos bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt. . . . Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus et monitus ab ecclesia, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac heretica fedelitate, per metropolitanum et cæteros comprovinciales episcopos excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo Pontifici; ut ex tunc ipse vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciari absolvet, et terram exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam, exterminatis hereticis, sine ulla contradictione possideant, et in fidei puritate conservent. . . .
—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., 148.

We, Protestants, she says, believe the Bible to be the Word of God merely on the authority of human reasonings. She herself, she says, on the contrary, places faith in it, because she accounts as infallible the testimony on which it rests. But who tells a Romanist that the Bible is the Word of God? His own branch of the Church, supposed by him to be infallible. A Romanist, then, boasts that he is *as sure* that the Bible is inspired, as he is that the witness to that fact is infallible. His argument is fair here. His certainty as to the authority of the Bible, may equal his certainty as to the infallibility of the Church which places it in his hands; but, receiving the Bible merely on the word of his Church, it is impossible that his confidence as to the inspiration of the Bible should be *stronger* than his assurance of the infallibility of the witness from whose hands and on whose sole credit he accepts it. We may well ask, then, what foundation a Romanist has for believing his Church to be infallible? If the Bible is to be received only on the testimony of one known to be infallible, this witness's infallibility must be received on the authority of some one else, previously ascertained to be infallible. If a Romanist were to believe his Church infallible on mere human reasonings and deductions, then his faith in the Bible, received on that Church's authority, would as much rest on human reasonings, as our own. On what grounds does a Romanist regard his Church as the one true Church? On what grounds does he believe that one Church is infallible? Will each individual Romanist pretend to a direct revelation from God announcing this fact to himself? No, doubtless! If not, will he pretend that the infallible one who maintains to him the infallibility of the Church is his confessor or parish priest, speaking officially and by the Church's authority? If so, the chain of evidence runs thus: every priest being so far infallible, supports the infallibility of the Church; and the infallible Church maintains the inspiration of Holy Scripture. But on what authority does an individual Romanist believe that each Romish priest is infallible? Nay, on what ground does he build his assurance, that any man calling himself a Romish priest, is really one at all? Does he receive these things on human testimony? If so, then on that, in the first place, rests his belief in the inerrancy of his priest; and the priest's word, in the second place, supports the Church's infallibility; and the Church's word, in the third place, upholds the inspiration of the book called the Bible. So that, in the end, the whole belief of a Romanist depends as much on human evidence, as our own does. If any link in a chain be too weak to support a weight, it is of very little consequence whether that infirm link be the one next to the weight, as in our case, or with a few interposed between, as in that of a Romanist. But Romanists, not seeing this, will wish, perhaps, to move the weak link a little further off still. Another infallible is called in, to speak to the infallibility of the man's spiritual instructor. Then we have Father B to prove the infallibility of Father A. But, then, who shall go security for Father B? Father C. must do this; and so on *ad infinitum*; or else the individual must believe his priest infallible solely on an immediate inspiration conveyed by God to himself personally. In that case, he is to credit it, not on human testimony, but because he has a conviction, that cannot deceive him, that God has revealed that fact to him. But, on the same authority, a Mormonite, or Irvingite, or follower of Joanna Southcote, may just as reasonably place faith in one of those unfounded systems. It will not satisfy Rome that God, having introduced Christianity into the world, established its claims by miraculous proofs; a superhumanly endowed witness must place the New Testament in each man's hand. Unless an infallible witness is thus brought into *immediate* contact with each man's mind, the Romish theory is incomplete. It is *there, next to the man himself*, that infallibility is required. Further off, a series of infallible authorities, each depending upon the other, are of no more use than the infallible Bible itself. Such an assurance as Rome demands can be had only by God sending an inspired messenger to speak to each of us, and, in that case, there would be little need either of the Inspired Volume or of the infallible Church to vouch for its authenticity. The meaning of the writings, when once their inspiration is acknowledged, is, of course, a different question—but of that hereafter.

Bishop Stillingfleet thus quotes and answers the Romish argument which I have been considering. The Papist argues—"As long as the infallibility of a revelation stands *remote* from me, for want of an undoubted application, made by an infallible proponent, it can no more transfuse certainty into faith, than fire, at a great distance, warmth" Stillingfleet replies—"If men cannot be infallible in believing the Apostles, unless there be other infallible proponents in every age, to assure them that the Apostles were inspired, why must not the infallibility of these present proponents be likewise so attested, as well as (that) of the Apostles; and what undoubted application can be made of the Church's infallibility, unless there be some other infallible proponent still to transfuse certainty into my belief of that by virtue of which I must believe all other matters of faith, which is the Church's infallibility. So that the last proponent must either be believed for himself, without any further evidence, and then the shorter way would be to believe the first so; or else there will be an endless

infallibility; or, at last all must be resolved into the enthusiasm of every particular person."—Stillingfleet's answer, &c., p. p. 78, 83.

I have now considered the first purpose on account of which the Church of Rome asserts the necessity, and, therefore, the *existence*, of an infallible living authority. I have, I trust, shown that, for the end proposed, such an arrangement would be altogether worthless; I am next to consider the other use of an infallible, speaking, authority—namely, as an expounder of the meaning of Scripture; this, with your permission, I will reserve for a future occasion.

Your obedient servant,

A KILDARE CHURCHMAN.

MASS IN THE CRIMEA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—We, in St. Giles, in London, sometimes get a look at your paper, and as I think you will give a straightforward answer to a plain question, I take the liberty of asking your honour about something we have heard lately from the Crimea, which might puzzle us all, and perplexes me out and out. We have always been taught to tell Protestants that the Mass is in the Protestant Bible, and that the last book in the Old Testament, Malachi I believe it is, says, that "From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering."

Now, I see by the "Life of a Priest," in your last number (page 6), that "it was Gregory the Great who decorated the Mass with incense and light," &c.; and we are told that Gregory the Great was the man that sent Augustine into England, and that was about the year 600. And, your honour, was it 600 years before incense was offered in any place? I suppose the priest that says so is a good judge, and wouldn't say so if it wasn't so. But what puzzles me entirely is, that it is to be offered in every place, and yet one of the Roman Catholic chaplains at the war tells us the contrary, in a letter which your honour will see in the *Tablet* of January 6, 1855, page 5. There one of our own priests says, "Last Sunday I read the service in the open field—to offer the Holy Sacrifice there is impossible. In a day or two I hope I shall be able to get a tent of sufficient height for an altar, so as to offer Mass in my tent."

Now, what in the world is the meaning of all this? I am sure I can never again quote that text against Protestants anyhow. Sure, Mr. Editor, wouldn't they turn round on me and say, that one of our own priests admits that the Mass cannot be offered in every place? and what am I to say then? Sure two or three days at the least he can't get a tent at all—he only *hopes* to get one; and only think, Mr. Editor, of all the poor soldiers that must die in that time, and yet there is no Mass for them, because it can't be "offered in every place." But more than that, we hear that the clothes, food, and tents sent out from England have been delayed or lost, and, perhaps, this reverend gentleman's tent was among them; or if he got it, it was a chance whether it would be the *proper height*; and if it was *too low* for an altar, Mr. Editor, what was to be done then? The people in England, I'm sure, don't know *what height* an altar should be, nor, indeed, do I myself; but that's, perhaps, my own fault; and I hardly think they would, in the hurry and bustle, think of making the tent exactly to the liking of his reverence.

As I know you publish letters asking information, perhaps you will print this for me, and ask *what height* an altar should be? and why it is impossible to have the Mass in the open air? Certainly I have heard of great storms out there, and 'tis true they might blow out the candles, if the altar was exposed; but if the Mass is to save souls, couldn't they do without the lights in the day time, and thus save the candles too—and, by the same token, we hear they are wanting badly out there during the cold and dark nights.

Mr. Editor, if any body can give me the desired information, I'm sure you can. It's too bad to hear that Protestants can preach and pray in the open field, and, indeed, in every place, and that we can't. Excuse the inquisitive letter of

POOR PADDY.

St. Giles, London.

We readily insert Poor Paddy's letter, and hope some of our Roman Catholic correspondents will enable us to give an answer to it; which, of course, would be much more satisfactory, than any reply proceeding from ourselves. Our opinions on such matters are already well known. True religion is an affair of the heart, and neither consists in Masses or candles, tents or altars. Let those who think otherwise answer our correspondent, and we will readily insert it.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR FEBRUARY.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette*.)

WHEAT should be sown, with as little delay as possible, after the weather clears up, and the land becomes dry enough; the best varieties to sow will be the white ones, of which the red-chaffed white and the white-chaffed white are the most generally esteemed; if possible the sowing

should be concluded within the month; but the true spring or April wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) may be sown as late as the middle of April.

Beans should be got in, as early as possible, this month. They require deep and clean cultivation, and a liberal supply of manure; good crops are obtained by broadcast sowing, and harrowing them in—this mode requires a clean tith; but if the land be foul, drilling them in at 2½ to 3 feet apart, will be the best mode; the most approved varieties are the tick, Heligoland, and Russian. A heavy, clay soil, but dry, is best suited for beans, and they make the best preparation for wheat, while the lighter and more calcareous ones are best suited for peas.

Peas should also be sown some time during the month; select the finer and lighter soils for their cultivation, which should be thoroughly clean, and moderately manured, taking the condition of the land into consideration, as too much would run the crop to too much straw; they may be sown either broadcast, or in drills 18 inches apart. If one-fourth beans are mixed with the peas they will serve to support and keep the latter off the ground; after thrashing they may be easily separated from the peas by a suitable riddle, though, if required for home consumption, it is not needful to do so, as both may be ground together for meal.

Spring Vetches should be sown early in the month, of a suitable breadth, to succeed the winter-sown, and be followed by successional sowings during the season, as will be directed in subsequent operations; the land will require a liberal dressing of manure; a little oats and rapeseed should be mixed with the vetches, which will improve the quality, and increase the bulk of the fodder.

Potatoes—Planting should be proceeded with when the weather is mild and open; since the appearance of the blight, planting potatoes have, with good results, preceded the sowing of oats and barley. Care should be taken not to plant in wet weather, or while the land is wet; in damp, backward soils, planting in beds is to be preferred; in light, dry soils they may be planted in the usual way in drills; but when an early crop is desirable the beds will, in most localities, be found the better mode, so as to obtain that object.

Rye and Bere may still be sown either for a soiling or seed crop.

Oats.—In favourable weather, and dry, early situations, oats may be sown this month, but in the majority of cases it will be better deferred till next month, particularly the white varieties; the black Tartary being hardy, may be sown by the middle of this month.

Parsnips may be sown any time during the month, providing the land be thoroughly pulverized, rich, and deep, and the weather mild and dry. Sow in drills 28 inches apart. Though parsnips may be sown with great advantage this month, we would only recommend sowing a small breadth—next month will be best for the general crop; heavy, deep soils, tolerably dry, are the best for parsnips, and they make an excellent preparatory crop for wheat; but light, sandy loams are best for carrots, though the latter, when rich and deep, produce excellent parsnips.

Grass Land, intended for mowing, should be no longer trespassed upon, but shut up at once; if to be top-dressed with compost, no further delay should take place; when dry enough, the top-dressing should be bush-harrowed, all large stones and brushwood gathered and raked off, ant-hills cut and scattered, and then well rolled.

Watered Meadows require particular attention during the month; see that the water be given in full and sufficient quantity, and that it flows evenly, regulating the outlets so that the discharge may be equal to the supply, allowing no stagnation on any part. When the land in one quarter is sufficiently saturated, which is indicated by a scum rising to the surface, turn the water off to irrigate another quarter, and when the first is sufficiently dry, lay on the water again; but in severe frosts, the water must not be turned off till the frost is gone; water should not be turned over land during frost.

Fattening Stock will now be approaching maturity, when sales should be effected, so as to economize provender for the stores which have the most pinching time of the year before them.

Ewes in Lamb will now require much care, turnips should not be given too profusely, and they should have free access to good hay, with oil-cake and rock-salt in their troughs; but sudden changes in their food should be avoided.

Fattening Sheep, and stores of all ages, should have a regular increase of artificial food, such as rape, turnips, mangels, oil-cake, &c., with salt. Those in sheds should be regularly littered, and have their feet examined and pared.

Fattening Calves and Lambs require great care and attention, with abundance of cow's milk, dry, warm lodging, and clean beds; salt and chalk should be laid in their troughs to lick at pleasure.

Fattening Pigs should have plenty of cooked turnips, mangels, or other roots, mixed liberally with pea, bean, or barley meal; clean out their troughs when done feeding, and give the refuse to the stores. All pigs should have free access to pure water.

Farm Horses.—As the days advance in length, and the hours of work increase, the teams will require full and liberal rations, and particularly an increase in the quantity of corn.